

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/563,610	ESKELINEN, EERO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL	2167	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL

(2) Shahid Alam

**Date of Interview:** 12 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*102 rejection*

**Claims discussed:**

*1 and 3*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Singh*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Examiner proposed an examiner's amendment to allow claims by incorporating the limitations of claim 3 into independent claim 1. Applicant's representative did not agree to the amendment, so a rejection will be issued.*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Naphtali Matlis, Reg. No. 61,592

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 430pm

/Alexandria Bromell/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2167  
 February 12, 2010

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)